

**Appln No. 10/840,169**  
**Amdt date March 4, 2008**  
**Reply to Office action of January 4, 2008**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-23, and 29 are in the application. Claims 3, 15 and 24-28 have been previously cancelled. Claims 13 and 16 have been amended to correct minor clerical errors and/or to better clarify the subject matter being claimed. That is, Claim 13 has been amended to the recitations of "generating subfield data corresponding to the selected video data" originally recited in previously canceled Claim 15, and Claim 16 has been amended to now depend from previously presented Claim 13 instead of cancelled Claim 15. No new matter has been added. Further, no new search would be needed because the limitation added to the independent Claim 13 was already in the claim set. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-2, 4, 13-14, 16, 24-26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (6,191,762) and Jeddeloh (6,157,398) and further in view of Nagai (6,608,610). Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Jeddeloh, and Nagai, and further in view of Sha (7,142,251). The Applicant respectfully traverse as follows:

Claim 1 recites, among other things, the limitations of "an RGB mixer for receiving RGB video data, and selecting data as a specific combination of the RGB video data" and "a subfield data generator for receiving the selected data, and generating corresponding subfield data."

As such, the combination of Kim, Jeddeloh, and Nagai do not disclose or suggest the recitations of Claim 1. That is, Nagai does not disclose or suggest the subject matter as recited above. Instead, Nagai teaches an obvious subfield driving method, which is as follows:

The video signal processing portion 15 mainly performs signal processing inherent in the PDP, such as sorting of image data. For instance, upon receipt of respective 8-bit signals for RGB in parallel, the video signal processing portion 15 performs processing such as sorting of the signals in the order of gradation bits so as to conform to the subfield gradation technique.

**Appln No. 10/840,169**  
**Amdt date March 4, 2008**  
**Reply to Office action of January 4, 2008**

(Col. 9, lines 39-47). As such, Nagai does not disclose or suggest "an **RGB mixer** for receiving RGB video data, and **selecting data as a specific combination** of the RGB video data" as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Specifically, as an example, page 12, line 19 to page 13, line 20 states:

The RGB mixer 110 receives the RGB video data from the FIFO memories 101, 103, and 105, selects two sets of them according to an RGB mixing algorithm, and outputs them as 8-bit video data to the subfield data generators 121 and 123, respectively.

\* \* \*

By using the above-described RGB mixing algorithm, three RGB component video data outputs are processed by the two subfield data generators 121 and 123.

The subfield data generators 121 and 123 respectively receive the two sets of video data output from the RGB mixer 110, that is, the upper video data and the lower video data, generate subfield data for representing gray corresponding to the respective video data, and output the subfield data.

By contrast, Nagai appears to disclose noting more than a processing portion 15 for generating subfield data (or a subfield data generator) that receive the RGB data and process these RGB data "such as sorting of the signals in the order of gradation bits so as to conform to the subfield gradation technique" to generate "subfield data."

As such, Nagai appears to disclose nothing more than a "subfield data generator" and does not disclose or suggest "an **RGB mixer** for receiving RGB video data, and **selecting data as a specific combination** of the RGB video data" as recited in Claim 1, which also recites "a subfield data generator for receiving the selected data, and generating corresponding subfield data" (emphasis added).

Similarly, Nagai does not disclose or suggest in Claim 13 of a method for processing address data in a plasma display panel (PDP) comprising "receiving RGB video data; **selecting video data as a specific combination** from the RGB video data"; and "generating subfield data

Appln No. 10/840,169  
Amdt date March 4, 2008  
Reply to Office action of January 4, 2008

corresponding to the selected video data" (emphasis added). Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 13 should now be allowed.

Claims 2 and 4-12 depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 1, and Claims 14 and 16-23 depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 13. As such, these dependent claims incorporate all the terms and limitations of their respective base claims (i.e., Claim 1 or Claim 13) in addition to other limitations, which together further patentable distinguish them over the references made of record. Also, Claims 6-12 and 18-23 are indicated as being allowable.

In addition, since Nagai does not disclose or suggest "an **RGB mixer** for receiving RGB video data, and **selecting data as a specific combination** of the RGB video data," Nagai certainly cannot disclose or suggest "an **RGB mixer** for receiving RGB video data, **selecting at least two sets of video data as a specific combination** of the RGB video data, and outputting the selected data" as are recited in Claim 29. Accordingly, Claim 29 should now be allowed for reasons similar to Claim 1, and for the additional reason that it recites "an **RGB mixer** for ... **selecting at least two sets** of video data as a specific combination of the RGB video data, and outputting the selected data [to "a subfield data generator"]."

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-23, and 29 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Peter C. Hsueh  
Reg. No. 45,574  
626/795-9900

PCH/pch  
SLS PAS773979.2-\* -03/4/08 10:15 AM